

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY
(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference yajima-001	FOR FURTHER ACTION		See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/JP2005/001512	International filing date (day/month/year) 02 February 2005 (02.02.2005)	Priority date (day/month/year) 02 February 2004 (02.02.2004)	
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237			
Applicant YAJIMA, Mantaro			

1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).

2. This REPORT consists of a total of 4 sheets, including this cover sheet.

In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application

4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis.2).

Date of issuance of this report 19 September 2006 (19.09.2006)	
The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70	Authorized officer Yoshiko Kuwahara e-mail: pt07@wipo.int

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

PCT

TRANSLATION

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Applicant's or agent's file reference yajima-001		Date of mailing (day/month/year)	
International application No. PCT/JP2005/001512		International filing date (day/month/year) 02.02.2005	Priority date (day/month/year) 02.02.2004
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC			
Applicant YAJIMA, Mantaro			

<p>1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I Basis of the opinion</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. II Priority</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI Certain documents cited</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application</p>	
<p>2. FURTHER ACTION</p> <p>If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPIA and the chosen IPIA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1(b)(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.</p> <p>If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPIA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPIA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.</p> <p>For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.</p> <p>3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.</p>	

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/001512

Box No. I	Basis of this opinion
<p>1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).</p>	
<p>2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:</p> <p>a. type of material</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> a sequence listing</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> table(s) related to the sequence listing</p> <p>b. format of material</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> in written format</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> in computer readable form</p> <p>c. time of filing/furnishing</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> contained in the international application as filed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> filed together with the international application in computer readable form.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.</p>	
<p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.</p>	
<p>4. Additional comments:</p>	

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY		International application No. PCT/JP2005/001512	
Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	1-20	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1-8, 16-17	YES
	Claims	9-15, 18-20	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-20	YES
	Claims		NO
2. Citations and explanations:			
Document 1: JP 9-134349 A (Mantaro YAJIMA), 20 May 1997, Full text; Figs. 1 to 54			
Document 2: JP 10-187679 A (Casio Computer Co., Ltd.), 21 July 1998, Full text; Figs. 1 to 9			
<p>The inventions of claims 1-8, 16-17 appear to involve an inventive step over each document cited in the ISR.</p> <p>Based on a "difference condition" and "first record" corresponding to a main area, generating "second record" corresponding to a derivative area is neither described nor suggested in documents 1 or 2.</p>			
<p>The inventions of claims 9-10, 12-15, 18, 20 do not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1-2 cited in the ISR.</p> <p>Document 1 (Fig. 9) describes specifying an attribute of a plurality of data input cells as a whole. Because storing a plurality of data in a single cell is a common method as described in document 2, applying a technology described in document 1 to processing a document format having the derivative area would be easy for a person skilled in the art.</p>			
<p>The inventions of claims 11, 19 do not appear to involve an inventive step over documents 1-2 cited in the ISR.</p> <p>As described in Fig. 9 of document 1, adding up each item is a commonly practiced method. In addition, because storing a plurality of data in a single cell is a common method as described in document 2, a constitution for inputting a calculation result in a calculation result input cell with keeping the main area and the derivative area separate could be easily conceived of by a person skilled in the art.</p>			